

# CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** Lease#2807-Improvement, Livestock Water Development

**Proposed Implementation Date:** June 2009

**Proponent:** Eney, Janet Quist & Martin D, Surface Lessee, Korner Ranch, Cut Bank, MT 59427

**Type and Purpose of Action:** The surface lessee has requested to revitalize an existing well by installing a solar pump and a new stock water tank at the well site. Also, the lessee wants to install a water line across the state land to an additional water tank that is located on private land. A detailed map showing the locations for this EQIP project lay out is included within this assessment. The primary objective is to enhance cattle distribution leading to better range utilization.

**Location:** Sec.36, T37N, 6W

**County:** Glacier

## I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	Mark O. Johnson-NRCS DNRC, Surface owner Martin Eney, Surface Lessee
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	There are no other agencies with jurisdiction on this project.
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Approve the requested livestock water development.  No action. Do not approve the requested...

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS
	N = Not Present or No Impact will occur. Y = Impacts may occur (explain below)
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactable or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] Soils and geology in this area are suitable for the well revitalization. A limited amount of soil disturbance will occur during the installation of the solar pump, water tanks, and water line. All disturbed areas will be reclaimed and reseeded. Cumulative impacts are likely to be minimal as the majority of the range has been renovated.
5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] The proposed action will improve overall water quality and quantity. This will lead to better livestock distribution and lessen the impact on the well area.
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed	[N] The proposed action will not impact the air quality.

<b>II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</b>	
action?	
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] Existing vegetation will be temporarily disturbed for the placement of the pipeline, but it will be on a small scale and will be reclaimed, so there will be no permanent damage. Cumulative impacts on the soil resources are not expected as the disturbed areas will be reclaimed and reseeded.
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] The area where the construction is taking place is not close to any area currently being used by wildlife. Cumulative impacts are not likely to occur and overall the project will make available a more reliable source of water for the area wildlife.
9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There are no species of special concern or any other sensitive habitat types associated with the proposed project area.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[Y] There was one or more tepee rings noted on the March 31, 2009 survey of the area. The lessee was made aware of the area and the line will be shifted to the west to avoid the identified tepee ring. Per a telephone discussion on 4/2/09 between Patrick Rennie and Tony Nickol, Patrick felt there should be no cultural resource concerns with the proposed water development and distribution system. Most of the state land was chiseled several years ago. A tipi ring size stone circle was identified on the tract by Conrad Unit staff, but this cultural property is outside of this project's area of potential effect.
11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] Revitalization of the well will slightly alter the aesthetics of the landscape in a positive manner. It will lead to the clean up of unused items around the well and provide for better livestock distribution in the pasture.
12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] The demand on environmental resources such as land, water, air, or energy will not be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project will not consume resources that are limited in the area. There are no other projects in the area that will affect the proposed project.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of other private, state or federal current actions w/n the analysis area, or from future proposed state actions that are under MEPA review (scoping) or permitting review by any state agency w/n the analysis area?	[N] Currently, there are no other studies, plans, or projects associated with the proposed project area.

<b>III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION</b>	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] The proposed project will not affect human health or human safety in the area.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL	[Y] The proposed well revitalization and water development

ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	will improve livestock distribution and generally improve the lessee's ranching opportunities and use of this state lease.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[ N] The proposed action will not significantly affect long-term employment in the surrounding communities.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] The proposed action will not affect tax revenue.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] This project is being cost shared under the NRCS-EQIP program. There will be no excessive stress placed of the existing infrastructure of the area.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] The proposed project is in compliance with Federal, State, and County laws. No other management plans are in effect for the area.
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] The area where the project is being performed on the State Land is not readily accessible to the public. The proposed project is not expected to impact general recreation activities on this State Land.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] The proposed project will not change the human population distribution or the housing requirements in the area.
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] The proposed project will not alter the social structure of the surrounding native communities.
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] The proposed project will not impact the cultural uniqueness and/or cultural diversity of the area.
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES: Is there a potential for other future uses for easement area other than for current management? Is future use hypothetical? What is the estimated return to the trust. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] No other unique circumstances exist.

EA Checklist Prepared By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tony Nickol

Land Use Specialist –Conrad Unit Date: April 1, 2009  
Title

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:	Approve the improvement request for upgrading an existing well, installing a livestock water tank and associated pipeline.
26. SIGN4IFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	Short-term and small-scale impacts to the native rangeland under and around the pipeline route is expected. All disturbed areas will be recontoured and reseeded to native grass according to the specifications outlined in this EA. Archaeological sites are present within the project area and have been flagged and will be avoided. The livestock stock water project will benefit pasture distribution and improve utilization. Overall, no negative environmental impacts are expected. This project is a cost shared in conjunction with NRCS – EQIP.
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:  <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Erik Eneboe Conrad Unit Manager - CLO  
 Name Title

/S/ ERIK ENEBOE April 3, 2009  
 Signature Date